general confines of Second Thursday, the idea being that no alleged wrongdoers would benefit, that the money would be put into an escrow, that the money that has already been paid is being divided up by the Bankruptcy Court.

I don't understand how there can be any concern with the wrongdoers benefitting under those circumstances, and these applications could be processed. But something needs to go to the commission. filed a request for reconsideration. We filed a request for didn't act on it. expedited action. They didn't act on it. That was early last fall. We can't get any movement.

JUDGE SIPPEL: It sounds to me like you are looking for the presiding Judge to nudge the Commission. I don't nudge commissions. I mean, it is just not going to work. There is not a thing -- If somebody comes up with something I can do, I will

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	listen, but I don't see anything that I can
2	do. You have got a situation with the
3	Commission.
4	You have a lesser situation, I
5	think, with me, in light of your status, but
6	you don't have to participate in this Issue G.
7	I am not going to let Issue G hold up the
8	processing of the consideration of Second
9	Thursday. I am just saying, if there is down
10	time here, which apparently there is going to
11	be some because we are waiting for the
12	finality of what is going on in the
13	bankruptcy, why don't we let the people who
14	are concerned with that get to work. That's
15	all. That is all I can possibly say. What
16	more can I say.
17	Anybody else have anything to add?
18	MR. ZDEBSKI: Your Honor, Charlie
19	Zdebski for Duquesne Light.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, sir?
21	MR. ZDEBSKI: There are Second
22	Thursday cases where individual license

applications have been approved without the entire reorganization plan being approved, and maybe that is the kind of thing that Mr. Richards is referring to. I wonder whether Your Honor would consider that approach?

JUDGE SIPPEL: Ms. Kane?

MS. KANE: Obviously, we don't -I am not sure that we would agree with it
being done in a piecemeal manner, and we are
still waiting for the ultimate question of
what are these licenses valued at.

applicable, then the case law is very clear that these licenses cannot be transferred to anybody while there is a hearing pending. The question of whether Second Thursday is applicable as a process and whether or not it actually proceeds to a resolution as to those licenses is tantamount to -- is necessary in order to figure out whether certain contracts can go forward.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Catalano.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. CATALANO: The point I would 1 like to make is, in the context of Second 2 Thursday, the earlier case law does not apply 3 to partition licenses. In this case, we have 4 a separate license, as counsel has pointed 5 out, and as I pointed out earlier, in the 6 Bankruptcy Court proceeding, the court made a 7 finding that the valuation was fair and it was 8 a good faith, arms length transaction. 9 It would seem to me, on that 10 record there would be a possibility to proceed 11 on the individual license applications as 12 individual license applications that have now 13 been taken out of the entire license package, 14 if you will, that is being held by Maritime. 15 Under our case law, 16 MS. KANE: Your Honor, I don't think that you can just do 17 18 a random assignment of a license that is currently in hearing on issues about whether 19 the licensee was qualified to hold that 20 21 license in the first place.

There is either a hearing process

or there is a Second Thursday exception, and
I am not hearing any basis for why that one
license, in the absence of having true and
correct and full information on the valuation
of the whole estate, should be handled
separately.

JUDGE SIPPEL: What I am hearing is -- Yes, I hear you, and I think what you are asking is very creative, creative in the sense of Second Thursday and how an agency operates. But for the life of me, I don't see how you would get final approval of that until these other issues are resolved.

I don't think that the Commission would approve of anything that was going out piecemeal. Now that is my view. I am not making that determination, but if you wanted to apply for some kind of special relief to the Commission and argue that point, that the Bankruptcy Court has no problem with your particular situation and maybe others similarly situated situations, and you want

1	some action on your earlier request for
2	whatever you are requesting, basically
3	approval of a license
4	MR. CATALANO: It would be
5	approval of the individual licenses.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, I understand.
7	MR. CATALANO: and within the
8	context of Second Thursday, we would meet the
9	standards. No wrongdoer is being benefitted.
10	The value is There is no excess value, and
11	there was a good faith finding by the court.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now hear me. Maybe
13	I am not making myself clear. There are two
14	questions. There is the question of the
15	overall application of Second Thursday to this
16	particular situation. The situation requires
17	bankruptcy approval of a plan.
18	So the plan comes into it.
19	Valuation is in the plan. All that has to be
20	looked at. You want your license situation
21	segregated from that, because and you made
1	

a good point -- basically, it has already been

cleared by the Bankruptcy Court.

Whatever the relief is that you are seeking from the Commission -- I believe you have something pending up here, don't you, either as an individual or as a group? Have you gone to the Commission at all?

MR. CATALANO: What is pending is the reconsideration that all the applicants are in requesting the Commission to transfer the license. That is pending, that issue, but that is a separate track to get the license transferred, Your Honor.

JUDGE SIPPEL: What I am saying is that I don't think that you are absolutely left without a remedy, but how successful the remedy would be -- and the remedy would be to seek some kind of -- I wanted to say emergency, but some kind of immediate relief from the Commission on the basis of what you have laid out, and try to expedite the request for reconsideration that way or something like that. But there is nothing. I can't start

1	piecing it out that way, because I know it is
2	going to just be sent right back to me. I am
3	sure it will be.
4	So it is all or nothing here, as
5	far as Second Thursday is concerned, unless
6	the designation were to change, unless I am
7	directed to do otherwise. And I am not trying
8	to hold it back. I am trying to get in the
9	position where it is put together so that it
10	is not going to come back to me.
11	MR. ZDEBSKI: Your Honor, may I
12	add in?
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, please. Your
14	name again? I know you are from Duquesne.
15	MR. ZDEBSKI: Charlie Zdebski for
16	Duquesne Light. The Enforcement Bureau has
17	been pushing to move ahead in this proceeding
18	and has questioned what has gone on in the
19	Bankruptcy proceeding, including the valuation
20	and the process of approval.
21	One way for the Enforcement Bureau
22	to get that information and to be involved in

1 the valuation question is to participate in a 2 bankruptcy proceeding. I think, Catalano said before, they have the right to 3 do it. If I were the Enforcement Bureau, I 4 5 guess I would avoid doing it, too, so that I could take a second bite at it when it comes 6 back here, but that is holding up the process. 7 We have people who are testifying, 8 9 being deposed, and people who are 10 valuation issue squarely before is the 11 Bankruptcy Court and will be decided there. 12 The Enforcement Bureau is deciding it will wait to come back here and then look at it in 13 14 the context of Second Thursday. So we have proposed a creative 15 solution to get our applicants with a need for 16 licenses for critical infrastructure out of 17 18 this situation, and what the Enforcement 19 Bureau is proposing is going to hold up the 20 process even longer. The Enforcement 21 JUDGE SIPPEL: 22 Bureau is just doing its job. There is all

kinds of reasons why the Bureau decision -the prosecutory discretion of the Bureau would
be whether or not to try and -- First of all,
it has to move to appear in the bankruptcy
proceeding. I am not sure s a Judge that
bankruptcy judge would particularly like
getting that message, and that is a management
decision in the discretion of the Bureau or
the Commission, not me.

So talk to Ms. Kane, but I don't think -- Well, I have said as much as I can. I can't do anything for you here.

MS. KANE: Your Honor, I think we have been extremely active in trying to move this case forward in this hearing, in this forum, which is where we are a party, and I think we find it offensive that we are now being accused of somehow trying to hold up this hearing and this process, because we are not participating for some prosecutorial reason or management decision as a Commission, because it is not the Enforcement Bureau that

would make an appearance in front of the Bankruptcy Court. It would be the Commission, and that is a totally different entity than us -- and that we are somehow trying to hold up the process here by not participating there.

The reality is that there are overlapping issues between the two, because of the fact that there is a bankruptcy proceeding, and Maritime intends to seek Second Thursday treatment.

There is an overlapping series of issues, which is why, if you recall, Your Honor, you allowed certain discovery concerning the valuation and concerning at least some identification of who the creditors were as part of this hearing process during our last prehearing conference in October.

Now with regard to that, we did get some of the valuation information, but we did not get what we thought we were going to get, which was an identification of not only who the creditors were, but what their

relationships were to Maritime. How did they
become creditors? What is their Why was it
that they lent money to Mr. DePriest? What is
their relationship, their personal
relationship or professional relationship with
the at least named wrongdoers, in order to
determine whether or not some of these
innocent creditors are, in fact, not innocent
for the very purposes of Second Thursday?
JUDGE SIPPEL: What kind of
discovery are you going to need for that? Are
you going to depose all these creditors?
MS. KANE: We would like at some
point at least to be deposing the Maritime
principals, but obviously, we don't want to do
that piecemeal. So since Your Honor has
allowed discovery to go forward on Issue G and
at least some limited amount of discovery that
was related to Second Thursday as part of our
last prehearing conference, we wanted to have
a single deposition and try to keep all these

depositions together. But since we have no

movement yet on Issue G discovery, we haven't 1 2 been able to pursue discovery of Maritime 3 principals on some of these other issues as well. 4 Well, you 5 JUDGE SIPPEL: 6 trying to shoehorn Issue G discovery into the 7 bigger picture, seems to me. Well, I am not trying MS. KANE: 8 9 to shoehorn it, Your Honor. It is a separate 10 issue, but the reality is that I have no if tried to take 11 doubt. multiple we 12 depositions of Mr. DePriest, either on Issue 13 G and/or on issues that might relate to the 14 Second Thursday, that they would put up some 15 sort of objection to that. So we were trying to get all of 16 17 our discovery ducks in a row before we deposed 18 some of these witnesses. To play that down, 19 JUDGE SIPPEL: 20 we could offer them a deal, either two for 21 nothing. You can answer questions about the whole schmeer, the whole thing, or you are 22

going to get questions on just Issue G. It is up to you. It is up to the Maritime parties whether or not they want to run the risk of being hit with double depositions. I don't know.

If it is a question of money from the standpoint of the Bureau's efficiency, then I am afraid you are going to have to wait. I am not sure what the answer to that is, but I am not going to give you relief on that basis alone. If you want to take a deposition from somebody at Maritime on the issue of Issue G, I have no problem with granting that, permission to do that.

MS. KANE: No, I understand that, Your Honor, but we have no discovery yet on Issue G. So it wasn't prudent to go forward with a deposition on those issues until that discovery is in front.

JUDGE SIPPEL: I understand. I didn't mean to say that that is what you should be doing. I am simply saying that is

the -- Now what discovery is needed on Issue

G that you haven't already undertaken? You

have already undertaken it, but you haven't

gotten the answers?

MS. KANE: We have -- As you

recall in the last prehearing conference, we

have worked with Mr. Havens and we worked with

their counsel to provide Your Honor with a

included a series of document requests and

joint motion for discovery on Issue G.

interrogatories.

9

8

10

11

12

13

15

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

We filed that, I believe, sometime in early December. You had asked to approve of that discovery before maritime would respond to it. Now in December Maritime objected to the discovery not in its scope, but only to the fact that apparently Mr. Havens was seeking similar discovery in other forums. But in that pleading, Maritime said they were willing to provide the information.

They have not provided it in absence of an order from Your Honor.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
2	Consider that done. You have an order.
3	Maritime has an order to proceed with giving
4	the Bureau everything they have asked for that
5	is not objected to. Just do it, but I will
6	get an order out on that today or tomorrow.
7	That is a failure on my part. I understand.
8	I have been preoccupied, though.
9	MS. KANE: And we understand that,
10	Your Honor. The other issue
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: I even had a
12	friend's funeral I had to go to yesterday.
13	MS. KANE: Oh, I am sorry about
14	that.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, this is how
16	things happen, you know.
17	MS. KANE: Well, that prompted our
18	motion to extend the deadline, which was last
19	Friday, for the discovery deadline for Issue
20	G, and I think now we are at a point, Your
21	Honor, where we need to set a new discovery
22	deadline for the Issue G discovery, both of

1	Maritime and Pinnacle Wireless, which you have
2	added in as a party, and maybe any other
3	parties who may have information. We don't
4	know yet, because we haven't received
5	discovery from Maritime as to whether any of
6	the other parties in the hearing may have
7	relevant discovery relevant to Issue G.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Any other parties
9	in this proceeding?
10	MS. KANE: They may.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Have you asked
12	them?
13	MS. KANE: Well, no, we haven't,
14	Your Honor. We served discovery on parties
15	with regard to very basic information early in
16	this case, and they have refused to respond to
17	that. So we hadn't proceeded with other party
18	discovery until we got discovery from
19	Maritime.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, wait a
21	minute. I am not talking about that. I am
22	talking about Do you have reason to believe

1	that any of these parties being represented
2	here, you know, the assignment parties I
3	don't know what you want to call them that
4	they have some knowledge about Issue G?
5	MS. KANE: I personally don't,
6	Your Honor, because we have nothing to
7	indicate that, but then again we did not know
8	that Pinnacle Wireless would have discovery.
9	They weren't even a party to this case until
10	they moved for intervention.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: It is a whole new
12	ballgame, but they have explained exactly why.
13	They have got a good reason.
14	MS. KANE: Agreed, Your Honor.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: I've got to be able
16	to safely get up and down the Jersey Turnpike,
17	you know.
18	MS. KANE: Agreed, Your Honor, but
19	we have basically been on hold waiting for
20	Maritime to respond to the discovery on Issue
21	G, and that
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I want to

move that along. I told you that. 1 MS. KANE: I understand that. We 2 assume that will inform our decisions going 3 forward in terms of discovery of other either 4 parties or nonparties. 5 MR. HAVENS: Some of the parties 6 are buying site based licenses. 7 JUDGE SIPPEL: Say that again. 8 MR. HAVENS: Your Honor, some of 9 the applicants' parties are purchasing site 10 based licenses. In regard to site based 11 licenses, therefore, they should 12 information on what they are purchasing. 13 JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I see what you 14 are saying. Let me just ask the question in 15 Does anybody -- Do any of these 16 general. 17 applicant assignment parties have 18 information on Issue G? Do you know what It is basically -- It was 19 Issue G is? construction of a particular location. I am 20 getting quizzical looks to denials, shaking 21

heads.

1	I could get something added to my
2	order and say that they have an obligation to
3	come forward if they have any information on
4	that issue, but again I don't want to start
5	poking around without having a basis for doing
6	it on fact finding.
7	Pinnacle should be able to give a
8	lot of information to you. They laid it out.
9	MS. KANE: That is only on two of
10	the site based licenses, Your Honor. There
11	are other licenses that are at issue in the
12	construction.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: IN the Issue G
14	issue?
15	MS. KANE: In the Issue G issue.
16	I believe there is something like eight or
17	nine site based licenses at issue, as to
18	whether or not they have been constructed
19	and/or discontinued.
20	MR. HAVENS: I believe all of them
21	are subject to Issue G. There is no
22	limitation stated on that in the hearing

1 designation order, and there are site based 2 licenses throughout the country. is JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Havens 3 talking. I am talking to the court reporter. 4 5 Well, there has got to be a better way to get at this than what we are talking 6 7 about here, but there has got to be some 8 specification worked out. I would ask the Bureau to undertake that as soon as they 9 reasonably can. 10 What I am talking about is narrow 11 12 down exactly who you have reason to believe 13 knows something about this issue, 14 certainly the site -- any site based location 15 alleged to be a venue for that is construction violation, whatever you want to 16 17 call it, would be the most logical place, and Pinnacle can start its discovery if they are 18 19 participating for that purpose, or Pinnacle 20 can give you -- Have you interviewed Pinnacle at all? 21

MS. KANE:

We haven't yet, Your

1	Honor. We were waiting until you made them a
2	party last week. So we are
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: They are a party.
4	MS. KANE: I understand. We are
5	in the process of preparing written discovery
6	for Pinnacle, and we expect them to be able to
7	produce that information.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: It is perfectly
9	proper for them to You need to pick up the
10	phone and talk to the attorneys, talk to the
11	principals, you know, if the attorney agrees,
12	and get as much information that way as you
13	can, but certainly proceed with the discovery.
14	But they seem to be willing to They seem
15	to be very willing to cooperate with you.
16	MS. KANE: They have been, Your
17	Honor.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go to it.
19	MR. PLACHE: Your Honor, just to
20	clarify. Matthew Plache speaking for
21	Pinnacle.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.

1	MR. PLACHE: There is one license,
2	one site based license, that Pinnacle leases
3	from Maritime, and it is station WRV 374.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Station RV?
5	MR. PLACHE: I think it is WRV
6	374.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: As in Victor?
8	MR. PLACHE: 374.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Where is that
10	located?
11	MR. KELLER: Has multiple sites.
12	MR. PLACHE: Multiple sites, yes.
13	MR. HAVENS: That is the Atlantic
14	Coast multiple station license.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Multiple sites on
16	the Atlantic coast?
17	MR. HAVENS: Yes, sir.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, thank you,
19	Mr. Havens.
20	MR. PLACHE: Our understanding is
21	Maritime does have a lot of other site based
22	licenses, and Maritime has information on the

1	construction of the licenses as well. But
2	Pinnacle does have information on what it has
3	done with this particular license.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: But there is a lot
5	more. There is a lot more than just what
6	Pinnacle knows.
7	MR. PLACHE: I can't speak for
8	Maritime, but
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, no, I am not
10	thinking about Maritime, but I mean there are
11	other sites out there that you really don't
12	have information on.
13	MR. PLACHE: Other stations that
14	Pinnacle does not have an interest in.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: So you would have a
16	lesser amount of information on those,
17	obviously, if any.
18	MR. PLACHE: I would probably have
19	as much as maybe less than the Enforcement
20	people.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Would you be
22	willing to have one of your principals sit

1	down with Bureau counsel and
2	MR. PLACHE: Absolutely. We
3	would like to do that, and I will arrange it
4	with Ms. Kane.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Fine.
6	MR. PLACHE: We are willing and
7	happy to cooperate.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: I am going to
9	assume that that is being undertaken, and then
10	is that satisfactory to you now as a starter,
11	obviously?
12	MS. KANE: Absolutely, Your Honor.
13	We were planning on starting that. Obviously,
14	we would like to also know what the general
15	timeline is for us to obtain all of this
16	discovery.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that is what
18	I am going to
19	MR. MR. KELLER: Your Honor,
20	excuse me. May I? Before we get on to the
21	general timeline, I just wanted to say a
22	couple of quick clarify a couple of quick